REMARKS

I. Status of the Claims in the Application

Claims 1 through 62 are pending in this application. With this amendment, claims 1, 4, and 6 are amended and claims 2, 3, 5, 7, and 8 are cancelled without prejudice in order to present claims in better form for prosecution in the present application. New claims 9 through 62 have been added. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the subject matter of the canceled claims or the claims modified herein through deletion or revision of claim language in further prosecution of this application or in a continuing application.

II. Summary of the Office Action

In the Office Action, claims 1-3 and 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ludwig et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,689,641 ("Ludwig"). Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ludwig in view of Plantz U.S. Patent No. 6,088,702 ("Plantz"). The Office Action also states that an information disclosure statement filed on February 27, 2002 failed to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(1).

III. Claim 1 is an Improvement on Ludwig

Applicants' claim 1 as amended is directed towards a method for sharing a rich media presentation among a group of collaborative participants. The method includes, among other things, storing a rich media presentation comprising dynamic objects that are time-sensitive.

In the present Office Action, the Examiner rejects claim 1 as anticipated by Ludwig. The present invention, as defined in claim 1 as amended, improves on Ludwig through various advancements. As such, all the features of method claim 1 as amended are not described or shown by Ludwig. For example, method claim 1 as amended recites "storing . . . dynamic objects" and "assembling . . . dynamic object." The terms "objects" in claim 1 refers to instances of an object class in object-oriented programming, as explained, for instance, in the present application in the Summary of the Invention: "[t]he individual element objects have properties, in the OOP ["object-oriented programming"] sense, such as start time, end time, and linked documents." An object, as understood in this field of art, typically includes variables and

methods. Ludwig does not mention or suggest objects or electronic structures having the same characteristics as objects.

Another improvement over Ludwig is based on the method of claim 1 as amended involving "a rich media presentation comprising dynamic object that are time-sensitive." This feature provides that individual portions of a rich media presentation are implemented as dynamic objects that are time-sensitive. For example, an audio object of a rich media presentation will have a start and stop time. Ludwig implements a system in which multimedia components are not time sensitive. As seen in FIG. 30 of Ludwig, Ludwig implements "a structure and timing component" that is a distinct and separate component in the Ludwig architecture that tracks activity (e.g., video or whiteboard) during a live conference to be able to recreate the conference. Thus, any timing characteristic in Ludwig resides in a single "timing and structure component" as that information is recorded during the conference. Any activity recorded during the conference will itself be a static file without any reflection of its location within the recorded conference. Accordingly, Ludwig does not describe or show "dynamic objects that are time-sensitive."

A further improvement over Ludwig involves the feature of claim 1 as amended that recites "**assembling** a plurality of the dynamic objects **on a server to present a version** of the rich media presentation." Assembling the dynamic objects of a rich media presentation on a server to present a version of the rich media presentation improves on Ludwig, which does not describe or teach assembling to present a version of the rich media presentation, or any form of assembling. As such, this feature provides advantages not attainable by Ludwig. For example, by assembling a plurality of the dynamic objects on a server, a presentation can be reconfigured or its content can be flexibly determined to assemble an appropriate version of the rich media presentation when the server is to present the rich media presentation. No such functionality is possible with the Ludwig system. Ludwig teaches a static architecture, mentioned above, in which a live conference is stored in a fixed file in the "multimedia document" format. The "multimedia document" format as shown in FIG. 30 provides a recording of various live activity that occurred spontaneously during a conference. Ludwig states that "[t]his format defines multimedia documents as a collection of individual components in multiple media combined with an overall structure and timing component that captures the identities, detailed dependencies, references to, and relationships among the various other components [in the

multimedia document]." As such, the "multimedia document" provides a fixed recording of the conference. As such, Ludwig shows that the components of a recorded live conference in Ludwig are self-contained in the "multimedia document" which requires no assembly for its playback to view the recording. In fact, in Ludwig, no assembly of the components of the "multimedia documents" to present a version of a video conference can be implemented since a "multimedia document" is held fixed by "the structure and timing component" of that multimedia document. See, for example, FIG. 30 of Ludwig. Ludwig is, therefore, deficient in showing that objects are assembled on a server to present a version of the rich media presentation as is clearly claimed in method claim 1 as amended.

Based, at least, on the foregoing, it is clear that the method of claim 1 as amended is not anticipated by Ludwig.

Moreover, the method of claim 1as amended is not obvious in view of Ludwig. As mentioned above, the invention of claim 1 includes at least a number of improvements to the systems and methods of Ludwig. The dynamic objects, their time-sensitive characteristic, and the "assembling" provide many advantages that are not attainable by Ludwig. In addition, Ludwig explicitly teaches away from these improvements, for example, by teaching the specific architecture described therein. As mentioned above, Ludwig describes the "multimedia document" format to include a separate and distinct structure and timing component that by itself controls the timing of the components of the "multimedia document." Because of this architecture, a modification of Ludwig to replace the components of the "multimedia document" with dynamic objects that time sensitive will result in both the dynamic objects and the structure and timing component of the "multimedia document" having simultaneous control over timing, which will result in conflicts between the two competing controls. Accordingly, claim 1 as amended is not obvious in view of Ludwig.

Since independent claim 1 as amended is allowable, claims 4, and 9-25 that depend therefrom are at least allowable over Ludwig due to their dependence from claim 1. Claim 4,which was rejected in view of Ludwig and Plantz, has been cancelled without prejudice.

Independent system claim 6 is allowable at least for the reasons provided with respect to independent claim 1 as amended. Since independent 6 is allowable, claims 26-43 that depend therefrom are at least allowable due to their dependence from claim 6.

Independent computer-readable medium claim 44 is allowable at least for the reasons provided with respect to independent claim 1 as amended. Since independent 44 is allowable, claims 45-62 that depend therefrom are at least allowable due to their dependence from claim 44.

IV. Information Disclosure Statement

In the Office Action, the Examiner noted that the previously filed Information Disclosure Statement failed to include a listing of prior art references. In reply, the Information Disclosure Statement has been revised to include an explicit reference to the prior art cited. Applicants re-submit the revised Information Disclosure Statement and related documents herewith. Applicants request that the Examiner enter and consider the Information Disclosure Statement.

V. Conclusion

On the basis of the foregoing Amendment and Remarks, this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants request reconsideration of the rejections and allowance.

Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the Applicants' Attorney if issues are deemed to remain prior to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 20, 2004

for Allan A. Fanucci (Reg. No. 30,256)

Reg. No. 45,697

WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
CUSTOMER NO. 28765
(212) 294-2603